



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/772,045	02/04/2004	Leif O. Erickson	56165US011	3924
32692	7590	05/11/2005	EXAMINER	
3M INNOVATIVE PROPERTIES COMPANY PO BOX 33427 ST. PAUL, MN 55133-3427			RAYFORD, SANDRA M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1772	
DATE MAILED: 05/11/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/772,045	Applicant(s) ERICKSON ET AL.	
	Examiner Sandra M. Nolan-Rayford	Art Unit 1772	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 February 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 23 February 2005 has been entered.

Claims

2. After entry of all amendments in the 23 February 2005 RCE submission(s), claims 1-6 are pending. Claim 6 is new.

Objection Withdrawn

3. The objection to claim 5 for use of the term "angle" is withdrawn in view of the explanation set out on page 4 of the 23 February "Amendment and Response" document ("the last response").

Rejections Withdrawn

4. The 35 USC 112 rejection of claims 1-5 for indefiniteness is withdrawn in view of the explanation given on pages 4 through 6 of the last response.

5. The 35 USC 103 rejection of claims 1-3 and 4-5 as unpatentable over Sundet (US 5,665,446) is withdrawn in order to apply the rejection below.

6. The 35 USC 103 rejection of claim 3 as unpatentable over Sundet in view of Futhey (US 5,840,407) is withdrawn in order to apply the new rejection below.

New Rejections

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

8. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The examiner is unable to find support for the language “having two projecting surface portions disposed at an angle with respect to each other” [Emphasis added] in the specification. The examiner acknowledges that claim 5 recites a similar phrase and that includes the language “at a right angle”, however, “right angle” means 90 degrees, while “an angle” reads on any number of degrees and is new matter.

Please either (a) point out the passages in the original specification that support the new language of claim 6 or (b) cancel that language from the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

10. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sundet in view of Futhey.

Sundet and Futhey are discussed on pages 4 and 5 of Examiner Brian Egan's office action of 02 July 2004.

This examiner notes the discussion of these references in that office action and maintains Examiner Egan's positions, as well as his claim interpretation statement 9see page 2 of the 02 July 2004 office action.

In the absence of convincing objective evidence to the contrary, the provision of right angles or any suitable angles, as indicated in claims 5 and 6 of the application now, is deemed a matter of design/engineering choice, depending upon the appearance or other characteristics desired in the final laminate.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments filed in the last response have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Art Unit: 1772

The arguments on pages 6 through 7 of the last response center on alleged differences in the processes by which the claimed laminates and those suggested by the combined references are made.

As Examiner Egan pointed out earlier, in his "Claim Interpretation" statement, the process by which the claimed laminates are made does not render the laminates themselves patentable.

Also, on page 5, applicant argued that the "right angle" limitation of claim 5 renders it patentable over the prior art.

However, applicants have failed to demonstrate, by convincing objective evidence, that right angles produce unexpected properties in laminates of the type claimed here.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be addressed to Sandra M. Nolan-Rayford, at telephone number 571/272-1495. She can be reached Monday through Thursday, from 6:30 am to 4:00 pm, ET.

If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful, contact her supervisor, Harold Pyon, at 571/272-1498.

The fax number for patent application documents is 703/872-9306.

S.M. Nolan-Rayford
S. M. Nolan-Rayford
Primary Examiner
Technology Center 1700

10772045(20050509)